REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-8, 12-15, and 19-29 are currently pending. Applicants thank the Examiner for his time and efforts in considering some of the pending issues and discussing these with the Applicants' undersigned representative.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 12-15, and 19-29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,962,452, issued to Nogami et al. (hereinafter *Nogami*) and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,438,566, issued to Okuno et al. (hereinafter *Okuno*). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the following reasons.

Applicants' claimed invention differs in operation and structure from the method and system disclosed by *Nogami*. As explained and depicted throughout Applicants' specification and figures, Applicants' proposed invention is directed to facilitating human review of computer program comment line translation. Applicants' proposed method for achieving enhanced comment translation review includes parsing out and isolating the comments from the code (the instruction portions), translating the comments, and combining the *isolated* comments with the translations of the *isolated* comments to provide a condensed forum for efficient review of the comment line translations.

Nogami's system does not disclose or suggest any procedure or device for effectuating any such extraction and isolation of comments for condensed review. Instead, *Nogami* is directed to using a specialized comment dictionary to handle specialized in-line text, loosely characterized as "comments." As explained at col. 1, lines 37-57, col. 6, lines 32-55, col. 7, lines 15-20, and elsewhere, *Nogami* explains that the invention is directed to translating a given language to another language, which includes recognizing and properly processing various structures, particularly in-line comments included as part of the original language syntax. This is in stark distinction to Applicants claimed "comment text items within [a] data processing system instruction data structure." Program code "comments" are universally understood to mean text having a qualitatively different syntax from the surrounding code text. Namely, the program code/comment syntax distinction causes a compiler to compile the code and ignore the

"comments." Applicants therefore contend that the meaning of the "comments" referenced by *Nogami* is not equivalent to the "comment text items" recited in the claims.

In further regarding to the grounds for the claim rejections, claim 1 recites, in part, "... a comment text data structure in which the copied comment text items are isolated from the program code items" and "combining each of the one or more translated text items and each of the one or more comment text items from the comment text data structure within a combined text data structure." In accordance with this express claim language the "comment text data structure" recited in the "combining" step must include the comment text items isolated from the program code. In contrast, at FIG. 3, and col. 3, lines 45-53, *Nogami* describes side-by-side display of translated and untranslated *sentences*, not extracted, isolated comments.

Nowhere does *Nogami* disclose extraction and *isolation* of both the translated and untranslated comments into a single combined text structure. Neither *Nogami* nor *Okuno*, either individually or in combination, discloses or suggests an equivalent to Applicants' recited "combined text data structure" that combines comments received from a comment isolation source (e.g. comment data structure 142) and translations of the isolated comments. Applicants therefore believe the foregoing rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney of record at (512) 343-6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew W. Baca
Reg. No. 42,277
DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
Telephone (512) 343-6116
Facsimile (512) 343-6446

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

U.S. Application No. 09/943,945   Amendment A – Page 3   Attorney Docket No. RPS920010057US1

PAGE 4/4 * RCVD AT 3/31/2006 4:22:11 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-5/22 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:5123436446 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-28